

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated February 18, 2011. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith. Claims 13, 14, 19-26, and 28-31 are pending in this Application, and Claims 21-24 were previously withdrawn from consideration. In this Response, Claims 13, 28, 29, and 31 are amended, and Claim 32 is newly added. The amendment does not add new matter. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

The Office Action rejected Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The amendment to independent Claim 13, that Claim 30 depends on, renders the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Office Action rejected:

- i. Claims 13, 14, 19, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,976,725 to Gamo et al. ("Gamo") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0011335 A1 to Zhang et al. ("Zhang") and also in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0129459 to Ovshinsky et al. ("Ovshinsky");
- ii. Claims 13, 14, 19, 25, 26, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,585 to Takamura ("Takamura") in view of Gamo, Zhang, and Ovshinsky; and
- iii. Claims 20, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamura in view of Gamo, Zhang, and Ovshinsky as applied to claims 13-15, 19 and 25-27 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,522,096 to Roth ("Roth").

At least in view of the amendments, Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejections.

Independent Claim 13 has been amended to recite, in part, "said electric power supply means supplies electric power to said predetermined drive section, and said fuel cell supplies each of the plurality of power generation sections generate and individually supply electric power to respective drive sections of said plurality of drive sections other than said predetermined drive

~~section~~ but not to the predetermined drive section.” The amendment is fully supported by the specification. For example, see at least paragraph [0051] and Fig. 4 of the published specification.

Regarding independent Claim 13, the Examiner relied on Gamo as a base reference for the first 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection, and relied on Takamura as a base reference for the second 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection. However, recognizing the deficiencies of Gamo and Takamura, the Examiner acknowledged that each of Gamo and Takamura fail to disclose “said fuel cell having a plurality of power generation sections” as claimed. Office Action, pages 3 and 7.

For both rejections of independent Claim 13, the Examiner turned to Zhang to teach this element. Specifically, the Examiner stated on page 3 of the Office Action:

However, it is well known in the fuel cell art to use more than one unit cell in series or parallel to increase the voltage or current, respectively, as taught by Zhang. Zhang discloses stacking a membrane electrode assembly in various combinations to provide fuel cells with more or fewer reaction zones and membranes. ([0043]).

Thus, as best understood, the Examiner relied on Zhang’s plurality of stacked reaction zones, in series or parallel, to teach the claimed “plurality of power generation sections.” However, Zhang does not disclose or suggest that each reaction zone individually supplies power to respective drive sections. Rather, reaction zones are connected to each other in series or parallel to supply a single voltage or current to all drive sections. On the other hand, Applicants claim “each of the plurality of power generation sections generate and individually supply electric power to respective drive sections of said plurality of drive sections but not to the predetermined drive section.”

Moreover, each of Zhang’s plurality of reaction zones (the alleged “power generation section”) does not include a plurality of stacked power generation devices. Zhang, par. [0043] and Fig. 1. Instead, the reaction zones themselves are stacked, and not the elements within the reaction zones. Conversely, Applicants claim in dependent Claim 29, “each of the plurality of power generation sections includes a plurality of power generation devices, the power generation devices having a stack structure.”

Further regarding dependent Claims 20 and 28, the Examiner acknowledged that Gamo, Zhang, and Ovshinsky do not “disclose the electronic apparatus having a plurality of drive sections and said fuel cell has the same number of power generation sections as the number of

said plurality [of drive sections], said power generation sections disposed respectively in the vicinity of said drive sections, and said drive sections are supplied with electric power respectively from the corresponding power generation section.” Office Action, pages 10-11.

The Examiner turned to Roth to teach these elements. Roth is directed to a mechanism controller for controlling power to motors of a robot. Abstract. Specifically, driver units 4.1-4.6 are directly connected to a voltage network by means of a mains power line 6. Col. 4, lines 15-17 and Fig. 1. The power from mains power line 6 can then be supplied to the driver units 4.1-4.6 and motors 1.1.-1.6. Col. 4, lines 58-62. As the Examiner noted, the drive units 4.1.-4.6 supply power to each motor 1.1.-1.6. Office Action, page 11. However, *drive units 4.1-4.6 do not generate power*. Rather, drive units 4.1-4.6 are supplied power from a single power supply via mains power line 6. Accordingly, Roth’s drive units cannot be equated with the claimed “power generation sections” because they do not generate power. Thus, the prior art, even if properly combinable, fails to disclose or suggest, “wherein said power generation sections are identical in number to said plurality of drive sections, said power generation sections are disposed respectively in proximity of said drive sections, and said drive sections are supplied with electric power respectively from corresponding power generation sections” and “the plurality of power generation sections are dispersed throughout the electronic apparatus.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the obviousness rejections with respect to independent Claim 13, and the claims that depend thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claim

Applicants note that Claim 32 has been newly added. The new claim is fully supported by the specification. For example, see at least paragraph [0035] of the published specification. Moreover, similar language was previously recited in independent Claim 13.

Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter as defined in the newly added claim is patentable over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above, and for the additional patentable elements recited therein.

Conclusion

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance, and allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

K&L GATES LLP

BY



Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer. No. 29175
Phone: (312) 807-4310

Dated: April 15, 2011